## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated January 13, 2005. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11-15, 17, 18, 22-24, 26, 27, and 30 are rejected, and Claims 4, 7-8, 10, 16, 19-21, 25, and 28-29 are objected to. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 13, and 24. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments and new claims. For the reasons provided below, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

### Section 102 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 5, 9, 12-13, 17, 24, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,601,175 ("*Arnold*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and the assertions and holdings therein.

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Arnold* fails to disclose, teach, and/or suggest at least "producing a coded password as a function of the generated password, wherein the generated password can be determined by decoding the coded password" as recited, in part, by Claim 1. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the nonce disclosed in *Arnold* is not a generated password as suggested by the Office Action and, in addition, that *Arnold* fails to teach or suggest that "the generated password can be determined by decoding the coded password." In contrast, *Arnold* merely discloses generating a limited-use administrative password using a serial number, a control password, and a nonce. Col. 7, Lines 21-47. To begin with, Applicant respectfully submits that the nonce is not a generated password as asserted by the Office Action. Page 2. Applicant was unable to locate any passage in *Arnold* that teaches or suggest that the nonce can be used to provide access to a computer system and/or used to verify a user. In fact, the nonce is merely "a [generated] value having a negligible probability of being repeated over the useful lifetime of the computer system." Col. 7, Lines 5-7.

Even assuming for the sake of argument that the nonce is a generated password, *Arnold* fails to teach or disclose that the nonce can be determined by decoding either the limited-use

hash and/or the limited-use administrative password. *Arnold* discloses that the enterprise administration obtains the serial number of a target computer system 16, the nonce generated by the target computer 16, and a known control password. Col. 7, Lines 22-32. After obtaining these character strings, the enterprise administration then derives a machine-specific hash by concatenating the serial number and the control password and then hashing the resulting string using a non-reversible hashing algorithm. Col. 7, Lines 29-32; Col. 4, Lines 40-49. A limited-use hash is then computed by concatenating the machine specific hash and the nonce "and then hashing the input string with SHA-1 or some other *non-reversible* hashing algorithm." Col. 7, Lines 35-38 (emphasis added). In other words, the limited-use hash cannot be decoded to determine the nonce. The enterprise administration then converts the limited-use hash into a limited-use administrative password and provides this password to the user. Col. 7, Lines 41-47. At most, *Arnold* teaches generating a limited-use administrative password that cannot be decoded to determine the nonce and, in fact, teaches away from such with the implementations of the non-reversible hashing algorithms. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *Arnold* fails to anticipate Claim 1 and its dependents.

Independent Claims 13 and 24 recite limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitation of Claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, these claims are allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Claims 17, 23 and 26 each depend from one of independent Claims 13 and 24 and are thus also patentable over the cited art.

## Section 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 2-3 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,725,382 ("*Thompson*"). Also, the Office Action rejects Claims 6, 18, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0139349 ("*Henn*"). In addition, the Office Action rejects Claims 11, 22, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,270,943 ("*Warn*"). Applicant traverses these rejections and all findings and assertions therein. In particular, these depend from one of independent Claims 1, 13, and 24. As discussed above, independent Claims 1, 13, and 24 are allowable over *Arnold.*

The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in *Thompson*, *Henn*, and *Warn* of the missing elements discussed above. Therefore, Claims 2-3, 6, 11, 14-15, 18, 22, 27, and 30 are allowable at least because they depend from one of allowable Claims 1, 16, and 19. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes and appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 4, 7-8, 10, 16, 19-21, 25, and 28-29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Claims 4, 7-8, 10, 16, 19-21, 25, and 28-29 depend from one of Independent Claims 1, 13, and 24, which Applicant respectfully submits are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant has- not so amended Claims 4, 7-8, 10, 16, 19-21, 25, and 28-29 at this time.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all Claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicant hereby requests a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of $120.00 for the one-month extension fee. No other fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

Michael E. Cox
Reg. No. 47,505

Fish & Richardson P.C.
5000 Bank One Center
1717 Main Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6107
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091

90119756.doc